

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2008

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 13, 15-16, 18-19 and 21-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 13, 15-16, 18-19 and 21-22 are amended and claims 23, 25 and 27-36 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 7-10, 15, 19, 21-23 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 6,510,144 to Dommetry et al. (hereafter Dommetry). The Office Action also rejects claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 16, 18, 25 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dommetry in view of U.S. Patent 6,247,058 to Miller et al. (hereafter Miller). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dommetry in view of U.S. Patent 6,172,986 to Watanuki et al. (hereafter Watanuki). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, Dommetry does not teach or suggest that the packets stored in the first buffer of the first foreign agent are directly sent by the first foreign agent to the second foreign agent. Dommetry also does not teach or suggest that the first foreign agent keeps storing the data packets being sent from the home agent until the first foreign agent receives a notification message from the mobile node, and the notification message informs the first foreign agent that the mobile node is not linked to the first foreign agent anymore. Dommetry discloses when the buffering and triggering mechanisms are implemented within a foreign agent, the foreign agent

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2008

knows when to trigger retransmission because the foreign agent receives a binding update message from a new foreign agent. The receiving node informs the location of the old foreign agent to the new foreign agent. More specifically, the new foreign agent sends the binding update message to the old foreign agent. See Dommetry's col. 7, lines 34-39.

Dommetry does not suggest that the first foreign agent keeps storing the data packets being sent from the home agent until the first foreign agent receives a notification message from the mobile node, and the notification message informs the first foreign agent that the mobile node is not linked to the first foreign agent anymore, wherein the packets stored in the first buffer of the first foreign agent are directly sent by the first foreign agent to the second foreign agent. Rather, Dommetry discloses a new foreign agent sending the binding update message.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Dommetry does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. The other applied references do not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1 missing from Dommetry. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 8 recites sending said packets stored in said first buffer by the first foreign agent to said second foreign agent and the second foreign agent storing the received packets in a second buffer if said mobile node is moved to the second foreign network from the first foreign network, wherein the packets stored in the second buffer that are received from the first buffer include packets stored in the first buffer while the mobile node is provided in the first foreign network. Independent claim 8 also recites transmitting said packets stored in said

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2008

second buffer of the second foreign agent to said mobile node, wherein the first foreign agent keeps storing the data packets being sent from the home agent until the first foreign agent receives a notification message from the mobile node, and the notification message informs the first foreign agent that the mobile node is not linked to the first foreign agent anymore, wherein the stored packets in the first buffer of the first foreign agent are directly sent by the first foreign agent to the second buffer of the second foreign agent.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Dommetry and the other applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 8. More specifically, Dommetry does not suggest that the first foreign agent receives a notification message from the mobile node, and the notification message informs the first foreign agent that the mobile node is not linked to the first foreign agent anymore. Dommetry also does not suggest that the stored packets in the first buffer of the first foreign agent are directly sent by the first foreign agent to the second buffer of the second foreign agent. Thus, independent claim 8 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 15 recites storing packets in a first buffer until a notification message is received from the mobile node, wherein the notification message informs the first foreign agent that the mobile node is not linked to the first foreign agent anymore. Independent claim 15 also recites sending the stored packets to the second foreign agent when the notification message is received from the mobile node. Independent claim 15 also recites that the second foreign agent receives the packets from the first foreign agent and stores the packets in a second buffer after the mobile node has moved from the first foreign network to the second foreign network,

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2008

and the second foreign agent transmits the stored packets in the second buffer to the mobile node.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Dommetry and the other applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 15. Thus, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 8 and 15 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 13, 15-16, 18-19 and 21-22 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **09/987,098**

Docket No. **K-0342**

Reply to Office Action dated January 24, 2008

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

**Date: June 24, 2008**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**